

SECRET

JOURNAL

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Thursday - 22 May 1969

1. (Secret - JMM) Called Mr. Carl Marcy, Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff, to advise him that we could not approve or sanitize the draft public speech he sent us yesterday. Mr. Marcy said he feared this would be the case and that he would report this back to the Chairman. See Memo for the Record for details.

2. (Unclassified - JMM) Called Mr. James Lowenstein, Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff, and, in response to his query of yesterday, advised (on the basis of information from OSR) that the number of Soviets in military uniform is 3.6 million. I said that this was an unclassified but substantially accurate figure and he could use it publicly.

Later in the morning, Mr. Lowenstein called back to say that Mr. Jack Stempler, L&L Office of Defense Department, gave him a figure of 3.452 million for U.S. men in uniform. Lowenstein said that the Director had recently told the Gore Subcommittee the U.S. figure was higher than the Soviet figure, and asked me to clarify the inconsistency. After checking with Bruce Clarke, D/OSR, I called Lowenstein back to explain the difficulties of arriving at precise comparative figures and suggested that it would be safer to stick to a statement that Soviet and U.S. military personnel strength are substantially equal. Mr. Lowenstein said he realized the problem was complicated and accepted this suggestion.

3. (Internal Use Only - LLM) Mr. David Muchow, BOB, called and advised that the proposed Foreign Military Sales Act is being sent to the Agency for comments, but we need not abide by the 23 May due date as we had been overlooked when the proposal was initially coordinated. However, our comments sometime Monday would be appreciated since the proposal is scheduled to be transmitted to the Congress the day after the transmittal of the Foreign Aid message which will be sent either Monday or Tuesday. [REDACTED] DD/P, and [REDACTED] DD/I, have been alerted.

4. (Unclassified - GLC) Hand carried to Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen's (R., Ill.) office a personal note from the Director to the Senator.

SECRET

SECRET

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
 Thursday - 22 May 1969

Page 2

5. (Confidential - GLC) Left with Winston Bryant, Legislative Assistant to Senator John L. McClellan (D., Arl.), copies of the latest exchange of letters between Senator Ervin and the Director on S. 782. Bryant said he was glad to have these since Senator McClellan has indicated he wants to do everything he can for us on this bill. I am to see Bryant again the latter part of next week to discuss this situation further.

6. (Secret - GLC) Met with Bill Woodruff, on the staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and briefed him on the situation regarding the draft speech referred to us for security review by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I left with Woodruff a copy of the Chicago Daily News item alluding to this speech. Woodruff seemed to feel that the Director had taken the right course with respect to this situation but added that Senator Fulbright now had an issue, i. e., the fact that he could not refute Secretary Laird's position on the ABM because of the security restrictions placed upon him. I pointed out that Senator Fulbright could have made this argument even if the speech had not been submitted to us.

7. (Secret - GLC) Met with Ed Braswell, Chief of Staff, Senate Armed Services Committee, and briefed him on the situation regarding the draft speech referred to us for security review by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I left with Braswell a copy of the Chicago Daily News item alluding to this speech. Braswell was most interested in this and the impact that it might have on future discussions of the ABM issue. He speculated at some length on this and raised the question of whether the Director should have stated his position to Senator Fulbright in writing so there could be no question about it. I indicated that I felt this would have been rather unusual under the circumstances and on reflection Braswell seemed to agree. As Woodruff had done, Braswell indicated this now gave Senator Fulbright an opportunity to say that he was hampered in rebutting what he alleges to be erroneous testimony given by Secretary Laird because security restrictions preclude him from discussing this issue in public. Braswell expects that Senator Fulbright will use this speech in a closed session of the Senate (such as the one last year on the [redacted]) and this would appear to be a reasonable assumption. He also indicated that Chairman Stennis will probably want the Director to brief the full Armed Services Committee in this general area before the ABM is debated on the floor particularly in view of recent intelligence on SS-9 deployment. 25X1A 25X1A

JOHN M. MAURY
 Legislative Counsel

cc:

Ex-Dir/Compt ODDCI

[redacted] Mr. Houston Mr. Goodwin
 DD/I DD/S DD/S&T OPPB EA/DDP

SECRET

25X1A

Conversation between Mr. Maury and Carl Marcy, Senate Foreign Relations Staff
22 May 1969

Mr. Maury: We appreciate your sending this draft and want to be helpful but we have problems with it. We have read it carefully and as you know all the Director's testimony before any committee has been in executive session and on a Top Secret level.

Mr. Marcy: That is right.

Mr. Maury: It is obvious that the main theme of this draft is derived from the Director's testimony.

Mr. Marcy: That is right.

Mr. Maury: We do not see how this can be revised in a manner suitable for publication. Therefore, I'm afraid we cannot be responsive on this request.

Mr. Marcy: So what you are saying is that the Dulles quotation is true, that one is able to read into this material what they want, depending on their prejudices. It does amount to a selective declassification and I don't know what we can do up here. There are two questions, as to the sources. One on which the information is based and the other the source as far as the Chairman is concerned. He would make a statement like this. We of course would not do anything that would compromise your sources and do not want to do anything that would hurt you with our domestic institutions. The Chairman would not want to be a party to that. I am not asking whether we can say privately that you have information to give us or that

eyes only

be read into it and that could cause trouble. Fulbright has already said he is going to assert flatly on his own that some of these things are not as Laird has stated.

Mr. Maury: Our concern, our primary concern, is the protection of what are in fact quite sensitive intelligence sources and methods. You know what they are and what it would cost us..

Mr. Marcy: That is number 1.

Mr. Maury: That is the basis for our position. It would jeopardize our sources.

Mr. Marcy: You feel a statement like that would jeopardize your sources?

Mr. Maury: Yes indeed it would. I have spent some years in Soviet field and this would be most helpful to them. We see your problem and are sympathetic but this is our life's blood and we cannot be a party to putting this in the public purview.

Mr. Marcy: That is what I hoped you wouldn't say but that is why we sent the draft to you.

Mr. Maury: I notice that there is no classification on the paper. I would hope that until you resolve this problem you would handle it on a TS basis.

Mr. Marcy: Yes, we are -- we have not shown it to anyone, not even to the boss yet. We have talked over the possibility of using this as a technique. I will send it to him with a report of your comments and I am sure he will react -- he will probably want to talk with the Director. I will tell him I have just talked to you.

Mr. Maury: I am sure the Director will be happy to talk with the Chairman

about this.

eyes only